

Diploid Alignment is NP-hard

Romeo Rizzi¹, Massimo Cairo¹, Veli Mäkinen², and Daniel Valenzuela²

¹ Department of Computer Science, University of Verona, Italy

² Helsinki Institute for Information Technology, Department of Computer Science, University of Helsinki, Finland

Abstract. Human genomes consist of pairs of homologous chromosomes, one of which is inherited from the mother and the other from the father. Species, such as human, with pairs of homologous chromosomes are called *diploid*. Sequence analysis literature is, however, almost solely built under the model of a single *haplotype sequence* representing a species. This fundamental choice is apparently due to the huge conceptual simplification of carrying out analyses over sequences rather than over pairs of related sequences. In this paper, we show that not only raising the abstraction level creates conceptual difficulties, but also the computational complexity will change for a natural non-trivial extension of optimal alignment to diploids. As of independent interest, our approach can also be seen as an extension of sequence alignment to labelled directed acyclic graphs (labeled DAGs). Namely, we show that a *covering alignment* of two labeled DAGs is NP-hard. A covering alignment is to find two paths $P_1(A)$ and $P_2(A)$ in DAG A and two paths $P_1(B)$ and $P_2(B)$ in DAG B that cover the nodes of the graphs and maximize sum of the global alignment scores: $S(\ell(P_1(A)), \ell(P_1(B))) + S(\ell(P_2(A)), \ell(P_2(B)))$, where $\ell(P)$ is the concatenation of labels on the path P . Pair-wise alignment of haplotype sequences forming a diploid chromosome can be converted to a two-path coverable labelled DAG, and then the covering alignment models the similarity of two diploids over arbitrary recombination.

1 Introduction

Pair-wise sequence alignments have been extended to capture many biological sequence features, such as mutation biases, repeats (DNA), splicing (RNA), and alternative codons (proteins) [3,4], but only recently the extensions to diploid organisms have been considered [7,8]. The motivation to model diploid alignment comes from the recent developments in sequencing and in haplotyping algorithms; it can be foreseen that one day we will have reasonably accurate haplotype sequences of each of the homologous sequences forming a chromosome pair. Such a *diploid chromosome* can itself be expressed as a pair-wise alignment that stores the *synchronization* of their haploid sequences, that is, telling in which positions a recombination is possible. Recall that a *pair-wise alignment* of sequences A and B is a pair (A', B') , where $L = |A'| = |B'|$, A' and B' contain $L - |A|$ and $L - |B|$ special *gap symbols* '-', respectively, and A and B are subsequences of A' and B' , respectively (see an introduction to these notions in [6]). A *subsequence* is a sequence obtained by deleting zero or more symbols from the input sequence. Now a *recombination* of a pair-wise alignment (A', B') is $(A'[1..i]B'[i + 1..L], B'[1..i]A'[i + 1..L])$ for some i . By deleting all gap symbols from the resulting pair, one obtains the actual haplotype sequences after recombination.

We identify two ways to extend the *computation of optimal pair-wise alignment* to diploid representation of two genomes. Let us compare homologous chromosome pair (A, B) to another homologous chromosome pair (C, D) . First, we could compute $\max(S(A, C) + S(B, D), S(A, D) + S(B, C))$, where $S(X, Y)$ is the *optimal pair-wise alignment* of X and Y (defined e.g. as the maximum sum of scores of aligned pairs $(X'[i], Y'[i])$ over all alignments (X', Y') of X and Y). This is a trivial extension, and does not need to be studied further, since the techniques for standard sequence alignments apply. Second, assume A, B, C , and D are result of *inexact haplotyping*, that is, a number of recombinations to (A', B') and to (C', D') are needed to obtain the correct diploids. This is an input one can expect from a sequencing project until perfect sequencing of haplotype sequences becomes possible. In this scenario, the natural extension of alignment is to look for a series of recombinations of (A', B') to (A'', B'') and (C', D') to (C'', D'') such that $S(r(A''), r(C'')) + S(r(B''), r(D''))$ is maximized, where $r(X)$ is the sequence obtained by removing gap symbols from X . We call this the (non-trivial) *diploid alignment problem*. Finally, assume that one day we would have the perfect diploid representations. Even in this scenario, just comparing two siblings to each other requires the latter approach of allowing free recombination; the recombination pattern is independent between the siblings, and the former approach would penalize from this natural phenomenon.

This non-trivial diploid alignment problem was defined in [7], but its complexity was left open; some polynomial variants of it were studied in [7,8].

In the following, we show that this diploid alignment problem is NP-hard. For the sake of generality, we study a more general family of problems on labeled directed acyclic graphs. This more general setting relates the results to variation graphs for pan-genome representation [9]; we continue the discussion in Section 4.

2 Covering alignment problems

Let Σ be a finite alphabet. Then Σ^* denotes the set of all strings over Σ and Σ^+ is the set of all not-empty strings in Σ^* . The empty string is denoted by ε . Let $\Sigma_\varepsilon = \Sigma \cup \varepsilon$: in this way, a total function on the extended alphabet Σ_ε can be read as a partial function on Σ . When

$S = s_1 s_2 \cdots s_\ell$ is a string, then the notation $S[j] := s_j$ offers an handle to the j -th character in S for $j = 1, \dots, \ell$.

For any two strings S and T , $d(S, T)$ denotes their *edit distance*, that is, the minimum number of symbol deletions, insertion, and substitutions to convert S to T . Using the notion of pair-wise alignments, $d(S, T) = \min_{(S', T') \in \mathbf{A}(S, T)} |\{i \mid S'[i] \neq T'[i]\}|$, where $\mathbf{A}(X, Y)$ is the set of all pair-wise alignment of strings X and Y . With scoring scheme $s(' - ', c) = s(c, ' - ') = -1$, $s(c, d) = -1$ if $c \neq d$, and $s(c, c) = 0$, for $c, d \in \Sigma$, the maximization of global alignment score $S(S, T) = \max_{(S', T') \in \mathbf{A}(S, T)} \sum_i s(S'[i], T'[i])$ is equivalent to edit distance computation, and hence we can consider the minimization framework without any loss of generality. Thus, we fix our setting to edit distance and call $(S', T') \in \mathbf{A}(X, Y)$ an *optimal alignment* if $d(S, T) = |\{i \mid S'[i] \neq T'[i]\}|$.

Recall from the introduction that a *recombination* of a pair-wise alignment (A', B') of strings A and B is $(A'[1..i]B'[i+1..L], B'[1..i]A'[i+1..L])$ for some i , and $r(A') = A$, that is, an operation to remove gap symbols. We can now formalize the main problem of this paper.

DIPLOID ALIGNMENT PROBLEM

INPUT: Alignments (A', B') and (C', D') of strings A and B , and C and D , respectively.

OUTPUT: Alignments (A'', B'') and (C'', D'') resulting from a series of recombinations to (A', B') and (C', D') , respectively, maximizing $S(r(A''), r(C'')) + S(r(B''), r(D''))$, where $S()$ is the global alignment score.

Now we consider a more general family of problems. For $\Sigma' \in \{\Sigma, \Sigma_\varepsilon, \Sigma^*, \Sigma^+\}$, a Σ' -DAG is a DAG $D = (V, A)$ plus a total function $\ell : V \mapsto \Sigma'$. In all three cases, the *read* of a path $P = v_1, \dots, v_t$ of D is the string $r(P) = \ell(v_1), \dots, \ell(v_t)$ obtained by concatenating the labels as encountered along the traversed nodes. Notice that we overload function $r()$, but this is intended, as will be see soon.

A string S can be expressed as a Σ -DAG $\bar{S}$ of width 1 and order n consisting of a path P with $r(P) = S$. That is, $\bar{S}$ is the path $P = v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n$, with $\ell(v_i) = s_i$. Also, let $\vec{\bar{S}}$ be the transitive closure of $\bar{S}$. That is, $V(\vec{\bar{S}}) = V(\bar{S})$, and with the very same labeling ℓ , but $A(\vec{\bar{S}}) = \{(v_i, v_j) : i < j\}$. Note that both $\bar{S}$ and $\vec{\bar{S}}$ are Σ -DAGs with an unique source and an unique sink.

Let $\mathcal{D}_1 = (D_1, \ell_1)$ be a Σ' -DAG with a unique sink t_1 and $\mathcal{D}_2 = (D_2, \ell_2)$ be a Σ' -DAG with a unique source s_2 . The Σ' -DAG obtained by adding the arc (t_1, s_2) to the disjoint union of $\mathcal{D}_1$ and $\mathcal{D}_2$ is denoted by $\mathcal{D}_1 \mathcal{D}_2$, justaposing the aliases, just as with strings, to suggest the concatenation in series of the actual objects. Notice that $\overrightarrow{\mathcal{D}_1 \mathcal{D}_2} = \vec{\bar{S}} \vec{\bar{T}}$ and, when $|S| \leq 2$, then $\vec{\bar{S}} = \bar{S}$ and $\overrightarrow{\bar{S}^M} = \bar{S}^M = (\vec{\bar{S}})^M$. Both for strings and for Σ -DAGs we regard concatenation as a sort of product, whence we could have written: $\overrightarrow{\prod_{i=1}^n s_i} = \prod_{i=1}^n \vec{\bar{s}}_i$.

Let D be a DAG. Two paths P_1 and P_2 of D *jointly cover* D when $V \subseteq V(P_1) \cup V(P_2)$; two such paths exist iff the width of D is at most 2.

For $\Sigma' \in \{\Sigma, \Sigma_\varepsilon, \Sigma^*, \Sigma^+\}$, consider the following problem.

2-PATHS COVERS OF MIN-EDITING DISTANCE IN 2 Σ' -DAGS (MIN-ED-2PC- Σ')

INPUT: Two Σ -DAGs $\mathcal{D}_1 = (D_1, \ell_1)$ and $\mathcal{D}_2 = (D_2, \ell_2)$.

OUTPUT: Two paths R_1 and G_1 jointly covering D_1 and two paths R_2 and G_2 jointly

covering D_2 minimizing $d(r(R_1), r(R_2)) + d(r(G_1), r(G_2))$.

In this paper, we study the tractability border of the above problem, trying also to address its many variants.

Most importantly, every Diploid Alignment Problem instance can be encoded as two Σ_ϵ -DAGs: For an alignment (A', B') , create nodes v_i^A and v_i^B , for $1 \leq i \leq |A'|$, with $\ell(v_i^A) = \epsilon$ if $A'[i] = ('-')$ otherwise $\ell(v_i^A) = A'[i]$, and with $\ell(v_i^B) = \epsilon$ if $B'[i] = ('-')$ otherwise $\ell(v_i^B) = B'[i]$. Then create arcs $(v_i^A, v_{i+1}^A), (v_i^A, v_{i+1}^B), (v_i^B, v_{i+1}^B), (v_i^B, v_{i+1}^A)$ for $1 \leq i < |A'|$. Finally, add source s with label $\ell(s) = \epsilon$ connecting it to nodes v_1^A and v_1^B with arcs (s, v_1^A) and (s, v_1^B) , and add target t with label $\ell(t) = \epsilon$ connecting it from nodes $v_{|A'|}^A$ and $v_{|A'|}^B$ with arcs $(v_{|A'|}^A, t)$ and $(v_{|A'|}^B, t)$. After encoding both inputs of the Diploid Alignment Problem this way, as separate Σ_ϵ -DAGs, the outputs of $\text{Min-ED-2PC-}\Sigma_\epsilon$ can be casted as recombinations of the pair-wise alignments in an obvious way. To the other direction the connection is more elaborate and will be detailed in the next sections.

For the other variants, clearly $\text{MIN-ED-2PC-}\Sigma$ is a special case both of $\text{MIN-ED-2PC-}\Sigma_\epsilon$ and of $\text{MIN-ED-2PC-}\Sigma^+$, which are both special cases of $\text{MIN-ED-2PC-}\Sigma^*$, but in the other direction the relations among these problems appear more obscure. Consider indeed the quite natural local reduction which replaces a node v labelled S with the path $P = \bar{S}$ on $|S|$ nodes, each one labelled by one single character so that $r(P) = S$; and where the arcs incident at v get updated as follows: the arcs of the in-neighborhood (the out-neighborhood, resp.) of v become arcs of the in-neighborhood (the out-neighborhood, resp.) of the first (last, resp.) node of P . It appears that the $\text{MIN-ED-2PC-}\Sigma^*$ problem is somewhat more general than $\text{MIN-ED-2PC-}\Sigma^+$, which is somewhat more general than $\text{MIN-ED-2PC-}\Sigma$, in that the above natural reduction has two pitfalls: (1) the above reduction does not work any more if we insist that at least one character of Σ to be attached to every node (we could not represent nodes having ϵ as their label). (2) at their extremes, the covering paths could only partly overlap with a path $P = \bar{S}$ representing a node v labelled with S . It also appears that the $\text{MIN-ED-2PC-}\Sigma^*$ problem is somewhat more general than $\text{MIN-ED-2PC-}\Sigma_\epsilon$, which is somewhat more general than $\text{MIN-ED-2PC-}\Sigma$, by the same two pitfalls in reversed order.

Given a Σ^* -DAG (a Σ^+ -DAG) $\mathcal{D}$, we denote by $\mathcal{D}_\epsilon$ the Σ_ϵ -DAG (by $\mathcal{D}_\Sigma$ the Σ -DAG, resp.) obtained from $\mathcal{D}$ by applying the above reduction, i.e., locally expanding nodes into paths.

Still we would like to treat the $\text{MIN-ED-2PC-}\Sigma'$ problem, seen as the ensemble of the above four ones, notwithstanding its wildy spurious nature.

Simple variations in the objective function value would also lead to different variants of the above problem. Besides the choice of the specific edit distance $d(\cdot, \cdot)$, a more general objective could be that of minimizing $\alpha_R d(r(R_1), r(R_2)) + \alpha_G d(r(G_1), r(G_2))$, and, at the extreme, it could be required to lexicographically minimize the vector $(d(r(R_1), r(R_2)), d(r(G_1), r(G_2)))$. Another natural objective could be that of minimizing $\max\{d(r(R_1), r(R_2)), d(r(G_1), r(G_2))\}$.

Whatever of these metrics we choose for the objective function, all $\text{MIN-ED-2PC-}\Sigma'$ problems can be solved by dynamic programming in the variant in which the two paths G_2 and R_2 in D_2 are not required to jointly cover the second Σ -DAG D_2 , it is only required from them to jointly cover D_1 [8].

Another natural variant is obtained by requiring G_1, R_1 to be disjoint paths of D_1 and G_2, R_2 to be disjoint paths of D_2 . One could also require that the paths G_1, R_1 (or G_2, R_2) to be disjoint, leaving to the other pair of paths the freedom to overlap.

In Section 3, we prove that the MIN-ED-2PC- Σ_ε problem (and hence the MIN-ED-2PC- Σ^* problem) is NP-hard in all of the above variants except those in which we said above that the dynamic programming solution stands. Remarkably, these negative results hold also in the case of a binary alphabet $\Sigma := \{0, 1\}$. The instances resulting from the reduction can also be casted as inputs to Diploid Alignment Problem; the two problems are polynomially equivalent on these instances and this proves that Diploid Alignment Problem is also NP-hard.

In the journal version of the paper, we will refine the construction given in Section 3 to obtain the stronger result that the MIN-ED-2PC- Σ problem is also NP-hard in all of these variants.

These reductions will confirm the potential in the general approach introduced in [10] to show the NP-completeness of the problem of deciding whether a string is a square.

3 NP-hardness proof for the MIN-ED-2PC- Σ_ε variants

In this section, the NP-hardness of MIN-ED-2PC- Σ' is shown for the case in which the empty string can occur as a label for some of the nodes, i.e., the labeling function is not total on V .

Denote by $\mathbf{N}_n := \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ the set of the first n natural numbers. The reduction, first described in Subsection 3.1, is from the following problem:

LONGEST COMMON SUBSEQUENCE (LCS) AMONG A SET OF STRINGS

INPUT: a set of n strings $S^0, \dots, S^{n-1}$;

TASK: compute a longest possible string S which is a subsequence of every S^i , $i \in \mathbf{N}_n$.

LCS is known to be NP-complete even when the strings in input are all binary and of the same length [5].

The general plan is as follows: starting from a set of binary strings $S_0 S_1 \dots S_{n-1}$, all of a same length ℓ , we show how to construct two Σ^* -DAGs $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}(n; S_0 S_1 \dots S_{n-1})$ and $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(n; S_0 S_1 \dots S_{n-1})$, such that the following two lemmas hold.

Lemma 1 *Let S' be a common subsequence for $S_0, \dots, S_{n-1}$, and let $\delta = \ell - |S'|$. Then there exist two disjoint paths A_r and A_g jointly covering $\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon$ and two disjoint paths B_r and B_g jointly covering $\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon$ such that $d(r(A_r), r(B_r)) = 0$ and $d(r(A_g), r(B_g)) = 2\delta$. Hence, $d(r(A_r), r(B_r)) + d(r(A_g), r(B_g)) = 2\delta$.*

Lemma 2 *Assume given two paths A_r and A_g jointly covering $\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon$ and two paths B_r and B_g jointly covering $\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon$. Let $d := d(r(A_r), r(B_r)) + d(r(A_g), r(B_g))$. Then there exists a common subsequence S' for $S_0, \dots, S_{n-1}$ with $\ell - |S'| \leq d/2$.*

As the reader will check, the construction can be easily performed in polynomial time (actually, it can be performed with only poly-logarithmic internal space). As a consequence, the above two lemmas (whose formal proofs will be given later, after describing the construction) will prove the NP-hardness of MIN-ED-2PC- Σ' on Σ_ε -DAGs in essentially all of the variants introduced. (Only minor modifications will also settle the variants requiring to minimize the functional $\max\{d(r(R_1), r(R_2)), d(r(G_1), r(G_2))\}$).

3.1 The reduction, and the general idea behind it

Let $S_0, S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}$ be n binary strings over $\{0, 1\}$. Assume we are interested into finding their longest common subsequence. It is assumed that, for each $i \in \mathbf{N}_n$, string S_i contains both a 0 and a 1, since otherwise the LCS problem can be solved in linear time.

In the reduction, M will play the role of a sufficiently big constant. A string T whose length depends on M will play as a firm *tab* gadget, capable of forcing an optimal alignment to align the i -th occurrence of T in one string to the i -th occurrence of T in the other string. Value of M and content of T shall be fixed by the following lemmas.

Lemma 3 *Let S be a random $\{0, 1\}$ -string of fixed length $|S|$ and let $\ell = O(\log |S|)$. Then, with high probability, S has no repeated substring of length ℓ , i.e., for any $1 \leq i, j \leq |S| - \ell$, we have $S[i..i + \ell - 1] = S[j..j + \ell - 1]$ iff $i = j$.*

Proof: Take $i \neq j$. We have $\Pr(S[i..i + \ell - 1] = S[j..j + \ell - 1]) = 2^{-\ell}$, since the events $S[i + \delta] = S[j + \delta]$ for $0 \leq \delta \leq \ell - 1$ are independent of probability $1/2$. Applying the union bound we get

$$\Pr(S[i..i + \ell - 1] = S[j..j + \ell - 1] \text{ for some } i \neq j) \leq n^2 \cdot 2^{-\ell} \leq n^2 \cdot 2^{-\alpha \log n} = n^{2-\alpha}.$$

□

Lemma 4 *Let $A = \alpha_1 T \alpha_2 T \dots \alpha_{q-1} T \alpha_q$ and $B = \beta_1 T \beta_2 T \dots \beta_{q-1} T \beta_q$ be strings, where*

$$|\alpha_1|, \dots, |\alpha_q|, |\beta_1|, \dots, |\beta_q| \leq M,$$

$$|T| = \Theta(qM \log qM + qM^2),$$

and the string T satisfies the thesis of Lemma 3 for $\ell = O(\log |T|)$. Then A and B have an optimal alignment which aligns perfectly the $q - 1$ occurrences of T in the two strings, for large enough $|T|$.

Proof: Take an optimal alignment and suppose that the k -th character of the i -th occurrence of T in A is aligned with the same k -th character of the j -th occurrence of T in B . Then, it can be assumed that the occurrences of T are wholly aligned, without losing optimality. Hence, it is sufficient to rule out any optimal alignment where some occurrence of T in A has *no* character aligned with any other occurrence of T in B . We show that such an alignment has cost $\omega(qM)$, so it is worse than aligning *only* the $q - 1$ occurrences of T , thus it is not optimal.

Suppose by contradiction that the i -th occurrence of T in A (denoted with T_i) is such that:

- for no $1 \leq k \leq |T|$ and $1 \leq j \leq q$, the k -th character of T_i is aligned with the k -th character of the j -th occurrence of T in B ,
- the cost of aligning T_i with the smallest substring of B containing the aligned characters (denoted with B') is $o(qM)$.

Observe that T_i is aligned with at least one consecutive substring B'' of B' of size

$$|T|/o(qM) = \omega(|T|/qM) = \omega(qM \log qM / qM + qM^2 / qM) = \omega(\log qM + M) = \omega(M + \log |T|).$$

This consecutive substring may include up to M characters from some β_h , but then it includes at least $\omega(\log |T|) = \omega(\ell)$ consecutive characters from an occurrence of T in B , contradicting Lemma 3. $\square$

The high-level structures of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are depicted in Figures 1 and 2. Here, $i \% N := i \bmod N$ where $N = n^2$ is, once again, a sufficiently big number. The strings $T_1, T_2, \dots, T_{N+1}$ are just identical copies of the tab string T , their subscripts are there only to indicate their depth in Σ^* -DAG.




Fig. 1. The high-level structure of $\mathcal{A}$.




Fig. 2. The high-level structure of $\mathcal{B}$.

Figure 3 defines the content of the $D(i)$ gadget, for $i \in \mathbb{N}_n$. Here, $D = 2\ell + 1$ is a sufficiently big natural number.




Fig. 3. The $D(i)$ gadget. The empty nodes are labelled with the empty string.

The value of M must be big enough to ensure that Lemma 4 safely applies. A first lower-bound on M , namely $M > 2\ell$, comes most natural after considering the statements

of Lemmas 1 and 2. A second and last lower-bound on M , namely $M \geq 4\ell^2$, comes after considering that any path entirely contained within a $D(i)$ gadget has length less than $4\ell^2$. Thus we set $M := \min\{2\ell, 4\ell^2\} = 4\ell^2$.

With this, the definition of the Σ^* -DAGs $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ is complete: they are produced by replacing the $D(i)$ gadgets with the corresponding i 's within their high-level structures. The whole construction can be easily performed within poly-logarithmic internal space. Clearly, the expanded DAGs $\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon$ and $\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon$ can also be produced within poly-logarithmic internal space since poly-log-SPACE is closed under composition.

Before proceeding to the proofs of the lemmas, we present a result that follows by a slight modification of the scheme.

Corollary 1 *Diploid Alignment Problem is NP-hard when alphabet size is at least 4.*

3.2 Proofs of the lemmas and corollary

Proof of Lemma 1 (The easy lemma): For $i \in \mathbb{N}_n$, since S' is a subsequence of S_i then there exists a sequence S'_i such that S_i is the shuffle of S' and S'_i . With reference to this shuffle production of S_i , assume to underline in green the $|S'|$ characters in S_i which originate from S' and to cross out in red the $|S'_i|$ characters in S_i which originate from S'_i . Also, if the j -th character of S_i is underlined in green, then let $\psi_i[j] := \varepsilon$, otherwise, if the j -th character of S_i is crossed out in red, then $\psi_i[j] := S_i[j]$. Notice that there exist two disjoint paths R_i and G_i jointly covering the Σ^* -DAG $D(i)$ and such that

$$r(R_i) = \left(\prod_{j=1}^{\ell} (\psi_i[j] 0^D) \right) \psi_i[\ell]$$

and $r(G_i) = S'$.

The reader should now check that $\mathcal{A}$ is jointly covered by two disjoint paths A_r and A_g such that

$$r(A_r) = \left(\prod_{i=1}^N (Tr(R_{i.mod.n})) \right) T$$

and

$$r(A_g) = S_0 \left(\prod_{i=1}^N (Tr(G_{i.mod.n})) \right) = S_0 \left(\prod_{i=1}^N (TS') \right)$$

The reader is also invited to check that $\mathcal{B}$ is jointly covered by two disjoint paths B_r and B_g such that

$$r(B_r) = \left(\prod_{i=1}^N (Tr(R_{i.mod.n})) \right) T = T \left(\prod_{i=1}^N (r(R_{i.mod.n})T) \right) = r(A_r)$$

and

$$r(B_g) = \left(\prod_{i=1}^N (r(G_{i.mod.n})T) \right) S_1 = \left(\prod_{i=1}^N (S'T) \right) S_1$$

Clearly, $d(r(A_r), r(B_r)) = 0$ and

$$d(r(A_g), r(B_g)) = d(S_0, S') + d(S', S_1) = \delta + \delta = 2\delta.$$

□

Proof of Lemma 2 (The hard lemma): We assume $d < 2\ell$ since otherwise the thesis holds vacuously. Let us introduce some terminology to precisely address some Σ' -subDAGs of $\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon$ and $\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon$. Where S is a string, an s -subpath of a Σ' -DAG $\mathcal{D}$ is a Σ' -DAG P of $\mathcal{D}$ which is a path with $r(P) = S$. Notice that $\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon$ ($\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon$) contains precisely $2N + 1$ T -subpaths (also called *tab subpaths*), and these are displaced as follows. For $i = 1, \dots, N$, we say that $\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon$ ($\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon$, resp.) contains two parallel tab subpaths at depth i (at depth $i + 1$, resp.) and precisely one tab subpath at depth $N + 1$ (at depth 1, resp.). The idea here is that within $\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon$ (or $\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon$) we can reach the nodes in a tab subpath at depth i from the nodes in a tab subpath at depth $(i - 1)$. Clearly, once a subpath of $\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon$ (or $\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon$) passes through the first and the last node of a tab subpath, it traverses it entirely, holding it as a subpath of itself.

Notice that each one of the paths A_g and A_r (B_g and B_r , resp.) must necessarily traverse precisely one tab subpath from any pair of parallel tab subpaths, i.e., precisely one tab subpath of depth i , for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ (for $i = 2, 3, \dots, N + 1$, resp.). Also, at least one among A_g and A_r (B_g and B_r , resp.) also traverses the single tab subpath of depth $N + 1$ (of depth 1, resp.). We claim that in fact, precisely one among A_g and A_r (B_g and B_r , resp.) also traverses the single tab subpath of depth $N + 1$ (of depth 1, resp.).

Indeed, for M sufficiently big, say $M > D\ell = \max\{d, D\ell\}$, and by Lemma 4, the tab subpaths within A_g and B_g (within A_g and B_g , resp.) are perfectly aligned in the alignment associated to the edit distance computation for $r(A_g)$ and $r(B_g)$ (for $r(A_r)$ and $r(B_r)$, resp.), there is no possible gain in loosing their alignment.

Notice also that one among $r(A_r)$ and $r(A_g)$ has the tab string T as a prefix, while the other has S_0T as a prefix. Moreover, at least one among $r(B_r)$ and $r(B_g)$ has the tab string T as a prefix. In the case of the lexicographic metric, where we assume $d(r(A_r), r(B_r)) = 0$, it can be easily enforced that $r(A_r)$ has the tab string T as a prefix. In the more difficult case where $\alpha_R = \alpha_G = 1$, we can ensure this by possibly swapping A_r and A_g (also swapping B_r and B_g at the same time). After this double swapping, it can be easily argued that also $r(B_r)$ has the tab string T as a prefix. It also follows that $r(B_g)$ has a string S'_0T as a prefix, where S'_0 is a subsequence of S_0 . This implies what anticipated above: B_g does not traverse the T subpath at depth 1 in $\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon$. And all the above arguments are perfectly symmetric.

At this point, to further proceed, we summarize the situation as follows:

1. the T -subpaths of A_g are precisely N : these are also T -subpaths of $\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon$, taken at depth $1, 2, \dots, N$, respectively;
2. the T -subpaths of A_r are precisely $N + 1$: these are also T -subpaths of $\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon$, taken at depth $1, 2, \dots, N, N + 1$, respectively;
3. the T -subpaths of B_r are precisely $N + 1$: these are also T -subpaths of $\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon$, taken at depth $1, 2, \dots, N, N + 1$, respectively. These are perfectly aligned and in phase with the $N + 1$ tab subpaths of A_r . This means that, for every $i = 1, \dots, N$, the red subsequence of $D(i\%n)$ within A_r is aligned against the $D(i\%n)$ within B_r ;
4. the T -subpaths of B_g are precisely N : these are also T -subpaths of $\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon$, taken at depth $2, \dots, N, N + 1$, respectively. Notice that the N tab subpaths of B_g are out of phase

with the N tab subpaths of A_g . Namely, the first tab subpath of B_g is a depth 2 tab subpath of $\mathcal{B}_\epsilon$ and perfectly aligns with the first tab subpath of A_g which is a depth 1 tab subpath of $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon$. Therefore, the green subsequence of $D(1\%n)$ within B_g , which comes just before it, gets aligned against the green subsequence of s_0 within A_g . More generally, the green subsequence of $D(i+1\%n)$ within B_g gets aligned against the green subsequence of $D(i\%n)$ within A_g .

This disalignment of the two green strands, standing the two red strands perfectly aligned, is the key engine behind our reduction. With this clear in mind we can now proceed.

The (d_1, d_2) -interval of $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon$ ($\mathcal{B}_\epsilon$) is the subDAG of $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon$ ($\mathcal{B}_\epsilon$) induced by those nodes which can be reached by some node in a tab subpath of depth d_1 and which can reach some node in a tab subpath of depth d_2 . Since $d < 2\ell \leq N^2/n$, then there should exist some $t = 1, \dots, N^2$ such that, the restriction of the paths A_g and A_r within the $(t, t+n)$ -interval of $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon$ are perfectly aligned (that is, perfectly identical) to the restriction of the path B_g and to that of the path B_r within the $(t, t+n)$ -interval, respectively.

But this fact allows to define a common subsequence S' to $S_1, \dots, S_n$ (it is explicitly encoded in the each restriction of the green path within every $(t', t'+1)$ -interval of $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon$ or $\mathcal{B}_\epsilon$ for $t < t' < t+n$, these restrictions being identical. And it can next be shown that $d \geq 2(\ell - |S'|)$ by chasing the drop in cardinality both on the left and on the right, since the distance between two strings is always lower-bounded by the difference in their lengths. $\square$

Proof of Corollary 1 (Diploid Alignment is NP-hard):

We use alphabet $\Sigma = \{0, 1, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{t}\}$ and fix the scoring scheme $s(r, c)$ as follows:

	0	1	$\mathbf{d}$	$\mathbf{t}$	'-'
0	0	-1	$-D$	$-\infty$	-1
1	-1	0	$-D$	$-\infty$	-1
$\mathbf{d}$	$-D$	$-D$	0	$-\infty$	$-D$
$\mathbf{t}$	$-\infty$	$-\infty$	$-\infty$	0	$-\infty$
'-'	-1	-1	$-D$	$-\infty$	0

Here $s(r, c)$ is given by the value at row r and column c .

DAGs $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ can be casted as pair-wise alignments by taking each *column* of the gadgets (as in the visualization) and considering the following cases: (i) if a column contains two nodes v and w with the same label $T = \ell(v) = \ell(w)$, construct a block $(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t})$ in the alignment; (ii) if a column contains two nodes v and w with one of them, say w , with label $\ell(w) = \epsilon$ construct a block $(\ell(v), \text{'-'})$ in the alignment; (iii) if a column contains only one node v labeled $\ell(v) = 0^D$, construct a block $(\mathbf{d}, \text{'-'})$ in the alignment; (iv) if a column contains only one node v labeled $\ell(v) = S_0$ or $\ell(v) = S_1$, construct a block $(\ell(v), \ell(v))$ in the alignment; and (v) if a column contains only one node v labeled $\ell(v) = T$, construct a block $(\mathbf{t}, \text{'-'})$ in the alignment. Concatenating these blocks from left to right creates pair-wise alignments (A', B') and (C', D') corresponding to DAGs $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$, respectively. The resulting pair-wise alignment (A', B') is shown in Figure 4

Consider a series of recombinations of (A', B') into (A'', B'') and a series of recombinations of (C', D') into (C'', D'') , that maximize $S(r(A''), r(C'')) + S(r(B''), r(D''))$, under the scoring function define above. We claim that $-(S(r(A''), r(C'')) + S(r(B''), r(D'')) - 2\ell)$ equals the optimal solution of covering alignment of DAGs $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ with the unit cost edit distance.

$S_0[1]$	$S_0[2]$	$S_0[3]$	$\dots$	$S_0[l]$	t_1	D_1	t_2	D_2	t_3	$\dots$	t_N	D_N	t_{N+1}
$S_0[1]$	$S_0[2]$	$S_0[3]$		$S_0[l]$	t_1		t_2		t_3		t_N		-

Fig. 4. High-level structure of pair-wise alignment (A', B') . The contents of blocks D_i are shown in Figure 5. All the t_i corresponds to the character t ; the subindexes are to shown the relationship with the graph $\mathcal{A}$.

$S_i[1]$	-	$S_i[2]$	-	$S_i[3]$	$\dots$	-	$S_i[l]$
-	d	-	d	-		d	-

Fig. 5. Pair-wise alignment version of gadget D_i . The character d corresponds to the paths 0^D in Figure 3.

For the reverse implication, one can map the alignments of red and green paths in the proof of Lemma 1 to form alignments of $(r(A''), r(C''))$ and $(r(B''), r(D''))$, where S_0 and S_1 are deleted from the head and tail, respectively, of the alignment corresponding to red paths. Alignment corresponding to that of green paths is identical, with respect to the mapping of nodes to symbols derived above. The claimed equality then follows considering the definition of the scores. For the forward implication, since all tab symbols $\mathbf{t}$ need to align in their occurrence order as in the proof of Lemma 2, and since recombinations inside the head (S_0, S_0) and tail (S_1, S_1) of (A', B') and (C', D') , respectively, are non-effective, an optimal series of recombinations is in one-to-one correspondence with the covering red and green paths as in the reverse implication.

Hence, solving Diploid Alignment Problem on these instances solves the MIN-ED-2PC- Σ' on Σ_ε -DAGs and due to Lemmas 1 and 2 would solve the LCS problem. $\square$

4 Discussion

It is evident that the reductions given here generalize to scoring functions beyond those considered here. We leave such development for future work. Notice that similar finegrained complexity analysis has been conducted for the LCS problem [2].

The reduction technique itself is likely to find other applications in the area of computational pan-genomics [9], where a natural representation of all common variations in a population is in the form of a labeled DAG. A direct consequence is that comparing two pan-genome representations is NP-hard, if accepting the notion of covering alignment developed here as the basis. As the labeled DAG representation loses the connectivity information on variations, one could resort back to a multiple alignment of haplotypes, and finegrain the notion of recombinations to allow only limited number of those. This notion allows parameterized complexity analysis, which we leave for future work.

There are many other open problems around labeled DAG representations of pan-genome, e.g. that of finding a small index structure to support efficient pattern matching. Such indexes exist only in the expected case or when limited to fixed pattern length [9]. This problem appears to be of different nature, and there a prominent direction is to look for techniques in [1].

References

1. A. Backurs and P. Indyk. Edit distance cannot be computed in strongly subquadratic time (unless seth is false). In *Proceedings of the Forty-Seventh Annual ACM on Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '15, pages 51–58. ACM, 2015.
2. P. Bonizzoni and G. D. Vedova. The complexity of multiple sequence alignment with sp-score that is a metric. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 259((1-2)):63–79, 2001.
3. R. Durbin, S. R. Eddy, A. Krogh, and G. Mitchison. *Biological Sequence Analysis: Probabilistic Models of Proteins and Nucleic Acids*. Cambridge University Press, 1998.
4. D. Gusfield. *Algorithms on Strings, Trees and Sequences: Computer Science and Computational Biology*. Cambridge University Press, 1997.
5. D. Maier. The complexity of some problems on subsequences and supersequences. *J. ACM*, 25(2):322–336, Apr. 1978.
6. V. Mäkinen, D. Belazzougui, F. Cunial, and A. I. Tomescu. *Genome-Scale Algorithm Design: Biological Sequence Analysis in the Era of High-Throughput Sequencing*. Cambridge University Press, 2015.
7. V. Mäkinen and D. Valenzuela. Recombination-aware alignment of diploid individuals. *BMC Genomics*, 15(Suppl 6):S15, 2014.
8. V. Mäkinen and D. Valenzuela. Diploid alignments and haplotyping. In *11th International Symposium on Bioinformatics Research and Applications (ISBRA 2015)*, volume 9096 of *LNCS*, pages 235–246. Springer, 2015.
9. T. Marschall et al. Computational pan-genomics: status, promises and challenges. *Briefings in Bioinformatics*, 2016. In press: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/bib/bbw089>.
10. R. Rizzi and S. Vialette. *On Recognizing Words That Are Squares for the Shuffle Product*, pages 235–245. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2013.